

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being added or cancelled.

Claims 1, 5, 14, 21 and 22 are currently being amended.

This amendment and reply amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-22 are pending in this application.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action, claim 14 was objected to because of a minor informality. Claim 13 has been amended in order to correct this minor informality.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 20903/0154390 to Yamauchi et al. in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0163724 to Tayebi et al. This rejection is traversed with respect to the presently pending claims, for at least the reasons given below.

Presently pending independent claim 1 is directed to a content information management apparatus that includes a collection processing unit, a conversion processing unit, and an output unit. The output unit is supported by the present specification and drawings (see, for example, paragraph [00058] of the specification).

(A) As to “a collection processing unit”:

The Office Action asserts that Yamauchi et al. (Figure 3, paragraphs [0087], [0066], [0071] and the like) teaches the collection processing unit as recited in the claims. Applicants respectfully disagree, whereby any teaching for a collection processing unit cannot be found in Yamauchi et al. In more detail, Yamauchi et al. merely teaches that a content-storing section 13 reads out a stored content and outputs the read content and information that

identifies the type, the file size, the reproduction time, and so forth of the read content to a recording management system 15. Even if “the type, the file size, the reproduction time, and so forth” can be said to be equivalent to “attributes”, the content-storing section 13 or the recording management system 15 does not “collect content information items indicating attributes of contents stored in different specific forms in storage devices connected to networks using different protocols,” as recited in the claims.

With respect to “using different protocol,” the Office Action asserts that Tayebi et al. teaches storage devices connected together in accordance with known network protocols (Page 9, paragraph [0122]). Applicants respectfully disagree. In particular, Tayebi et al. merely teaches that, concerning the functions of the IDC 11 (in Figure 2 of Tayebi et al.), functionalities can be divided between a plurality of computing and storage devices or servers connected together in accordance with known network protocols. This does not teach or suggest that “contents are stored in different specific forms in storage devices,” as recited in the claims. Furthermore, there is no motivation in Tayebi et al. that a certain device “collects” content information items indicating “attributes” of contents stored in different storage devices.

Consequently, neither Yamauchi et al. nor Tayebi et al., taken singly or in combination, teaches the “collection processing unit” as recited in claim 1.

(B) As to “a conversion processing unit”:

The Office Action asserts that Yamauchi et al. (paragraphs [0068], [0089] and the like) teaches the conversion processing unit as recited in the claims. Applicants respectfully disagree, whereby any teaching for a conversion processing unit cannot be found in Yamauchi et al. In more detail, Yamauchi et al. merely teaches that a converting device 39A (in Figure 2 of Yamauchi et al.) in a storing section 8 (in Figure 3 of Yamauchi et al.) converts the content to be stored into another format, for example, from the MPEG 2 format into MPEG 4 format, or from the high-definition television format into the standard-definition television format. It is to be noted that the converting device 39A in a storing section 8 does not “convert each of the content information items collected by the collection processing unit into content information of a standardized form.”

Consequently, Yamauchi et al. fails to teach the “conversion processing unit” as recited in claim 1.

(C) As to "an output unit":

The Office Action asserts that Yamauchi et al. (paragraph [0089] and the like) teaches the display as recited in the claims. Applicants respectfully disagree. In particular, information displayed by a monitor section 17 (in Figure 3 of Yamauchi et al.) is not equivalent to the content information of the standardized form converted by the conversion processing unit. Accordingly, Yamauchi et al. does not teach or suggest "outputting the content information of the standardized form converted by the conversion processing unit."

Consequently, Yamauchi et al. fails to teach the "output unit" as recited claim 1.

Conclusion:

Based on the comments provided above, even if Tayebi et al. is combined with Yamauchi et al., such a combination falls well short of the presently claimed invention. Accordingly, since the other independent claims recite similar features to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, all of the presently pending claims are believed to be in allowable form, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0872. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-0872. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0872.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 3, 2006

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 23392
Telephone: (310) 975-7895
Facsimile: (310) 557-8475

Pavan K. Agarwal
Registration No. 40,888

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819